UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

For participants only

E/1991/SR.12
5 June 1991

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

First regular session of 1991

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 12th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 30 May 1991, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. ELIASSON (Sweden)

CONTENTS

Elections and nominations (continued)

World social situation

Social development

Advancement of women

Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (continued)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

ELECTIONS AND NOMINATIONS (continued)

Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund

The PRESIDENT announced the results of the second ballot for candidates from the group of Eastern European States to the Executive Board of UNICEF.

Number of ballot papers:	54
Invalid ballots:	0
Valid ballots:	54
Abstentions:	0
Members voting:	54
Majority required:	28
Number of votes obtained:	
USSR:	31
Bulgaria:	23

Having obtained the required majority, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was declared elected to the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund for a three-year term beginning 1 August 1991.

International Narcotics Control Board (E/1991/49)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect five members of the International Narcotics Control Board from candidates nominated by Members of the United Nations and Parties to the Single Convention which were not Members of the United Nations, in accordance with article 9, paragraph 1, subparagraphs (a) and (b) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the 1972 Protocol. He also drew attention to paragraph 3 of article 9.

(The President)

The Secretariat had been informed by the Chairman of the Asian Group that the candidacies of Sirad Atmodjo (Indonesia), A. R. Khandakar (Bangladesh) and A. Sadique (Bangladesh) had been withdrawn.

The Chairman of the Eastern European Group had also informed the Secretariat that the candidacies of Miloslav Krsiak (Czechoslovakia), Constantin Popescu (Romania) and Vido Popadic (Yugoslavia) had been withdrawn.

The Chairman of the Latin American and Caribbean Group had informed the Secretariat that the candidacy of Ernesto de la Guardia (Argentina) had been withdrawn and that the candidature of Manuel Quijano Narezo (Mexico) had been endorsed by that Group.

The Secretariat had been informed by the Chairman of the Western European and Other States Group that the candidacies of Kenneth William Edmondson (Australia), Sükrü Elekdag (Turkey), Christos Kiropoulos (Greece) and David Scicluna (Malta) had been withdrawn.

At the invitation of the President, Mrs. Kuntjoro Jakti (Indonesia) and Mr. Svetlozar Panov (Bulgaria) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	52
Number of invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	52
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	52
Required majority:	27

Number of votes obtained:

Mr. Okun (United States of America)	30
Mr. Machata (Austria)	29
Mr. Martin (Thailand)	27
Mr. Quijano Narezo (Mexico)	27
Mr. Polimeni (Italy)	25
Mr. Ali Khan (Pakistan)	23

Mr. Queneudec (France)	20
Mr. Bulaev (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)	12
Mr. Fantohou (Togo)	9
Mr. Zapatero (Spain)	8
Mr. Bayer (Hungary)	6
Mr. Elmi (Somalia)	6
Mr. Oyakhilome (Nigeria)	6
Mr. Sangaré (Guinea)	5
Mr. Abushama (Sudan)	4
Mr. Abdel Rahman (Sudan)	3
Mr. Dinga (Congo)	3
Mr. Gonzalez (Philippines)	3
Mr. Karugaba (Uganda)	3
Mr. Wieniawski (Poland)	2

Having obtained the required majority, Mr. Okun (United States of America), Mr. Machata (Austria), Mr. Martin (Thailand) and Mr. Quijano Narezo (Mexico) were elected members of the International Narcotics Control Board for a term beginning 1 March 1992.

The PRESIDENT said that, as one seat remained to be filled, a second ballot would be conducted between Mr. Polimeni (Italy) and Mr. Ali Khan (Pakistan) in accordance with rule 69 of the rules of procedure of the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mrs. Kuntjoro Jakti (Indonesia) and Mr. Svetlozar Panov (Bulgaria) acted as tellers.

A second vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	54
Number of invalid ballots:	1
Number of valid ballots:	53
Number of abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	53
Required majority:	27

Number of votes obtained:

Mr. Ali Khan (Pakistan) 30

Mr. Polimeni (Italy) 23

Having obtained the required majority, Mr. Ali Khan (Pakistan) was elected as a member of the International Narcotics Control Board for a term beginning 1 March 1992.

WORLD SOCIAL SITUATION (E/1991/84)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Second (Social) Committee issued in document E/1991/84. In paragraph 20, the Committee had recommended the adoption of two draft resolutions.

Draft resolution I

Draft resolution I was adopted without a vote.

Mr. MARKS (United States of America) said that, in the spirit of compromise, his delegation had joined in the consensus adoption of the resolution, but had done so with reservations. His delegation had welcomed the new tone of the Secretary-General's interim report, noting that it reflected the new economic trends at work. However, other delegations had criticized it for the same reason. The resolution just adopted implicitly criticized the report for taking a more realistic approach to the world social situation and economic factors affecting it. The Secretary-General had not strayed from the established terms of reference, and should not be criticized for pursuing a more balanced approach. His delegation awaited the publication of the 1993 report with great interest, and hoped that it would reflect objective scholarship.

Draft resolution II

Mrs. LIMJUCO (Observer for the Philippines) said that her delegation had joined the list of co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

Mr. ALI (Iraq) said that the crisis involving Iraqi refugees and displaced persons resulted from an external conspiracy against Iraq following the Gulf War cease-fire, and from the intervention of several countries with imperialist designs in the internal affairs of Iraq with the aim of ensuring the failure of the current regime. Infiltration had also occurred from

(Mr. Ali, Iraq)

neighbouring countries, using arms and money from the large countries, to attempt to destabilize the regime and create chaos.

Iraq had welcomed United Nations and specialized agency efforts to settle the problem of displaced persons quickly, and had extended every facility to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General so that those persons could return home with dignity. It was thus effectively cooperating with the United Nations to settle the problem, and it rejected all attempts to exploit the situation of the displaced persons to give an international character to the crisis on the pretext of granting them due protection.

Paragraph 8 of the resolution appeared to equate the problem of displaced Iraqis with that of the Palestinians displaced from their homeland by foreign occupation, in that the Secretary-General had been asked to submit interim reports. However, the problem in Iraq was temporary and should be resolved within weeks or even days. A major step in that direction would be the lifting of economic sanctions against Iraq, in order to end the suffering of the entire Iraqi people. If implementation of the memorandum of understanding between Iraq and the United Nations had been speeded up, the refugees could have returned to their homeland with all due dignity.

Draft resolution II was adopted without a vote.

Mr. BRITO CRUZ (Brazil) said that his delegation expressed its solidarity with the sufferings of Iraqi refugees and displaced persons. The draft resolution was important as a means of raising awareness and enhancing international cooperation to alleviate their plight. The action to that end should be understood more in the light of norms of international humanitarian law than in the context of basic norms of international law governing relations among States. Adoption of the draft resolution could not be construed as implying that all actions taken to deal with the situation faced by Iraqi refugees could be regarded as a valid legal precedent or model applicable to relations among States.

Draft decision I

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft decision contained in paragraph 21 of E/1991/85.

The decision was adopted without a vote.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (E/1991/85, E/1991/26)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Second (Social) Committee on social development. In paragraph 41 of E/1991/85, the Committee recommended the adoption of 11 draft resolutions.

Draft resolutions I to IX

Draft resolutions I to IX were adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution X

The draft resolution was adopted without a vote.

Mr. MARKS (United States of America) said that, while his delegation approved the spirit of cooperation and flexibility which had been demonstrated, it would have preferred not to have a resolution on crime prevention, because the entire programme was subject to review by the Intergovernmental Working Group. His delegation was also concerned about the process whereby the conclusions of the Eighth Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, as referred to in the fifth preambular paragraph and paragraph 2 of the resolution, had been reached.

Draft resolution XI

Draft resolution XI was adopted without a vote.

Draft decisions I to V

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the five draft decisions recommended for adoption in paragraph 42 of E/1991/85.

Draft decisions I to IV were adopted without a vote.

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision V.

Draft decision V was adopted without a vote.

Mr. MARKS (United States of America) said that his delegation welcomed the constructive spirit of the informal consultations, but believed that consideration of the convening of a world summit for social development should have taken place in the Committee on Social Development, and that the draft decision was, therefore, inappropriate. His Government would participate in the discussions, but dissociated itself from the adoption of the decision.

ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN (E/1991/87, E/1991/28)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on nine draft resolutions which the Second (Social) Committee recommended for adoption. Draft resolutions I to VII were contained in the report of the Commission on the Status of Women (E/1991/28).

Draft resolutions I and II

Draft resolutions I and II were adopted.

Draft resolution III

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Second (Social) Committee had adopted draft resolution III by a recorded vote of 36 to 1, with 10 abstentions.

Mr. TENNE (Israel) said the work of the Commission on the Status of Women was too important to be politicized and diverted from its vital purposes, yet that was exactly what happened when politically motivated resolutions such as draft resolution III were routinely rammed through the Commission and then through the Economic and Social Council.

The authentic concern of some delegations for the situation of Palestinian women should have led them to consider the causes of the situation and not merely its effects. The resolution was replete with falsehoods and distortions, except for one reference to the "harmful effects" of the intifadah on Palestinian women and children. No reference was made to the dozens of Palestinian women who were among the more than 450 Palestinians slain by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in the intifidah. Women had been singled out by the death squads of the PLO. Women in their ninth month of pregnancy had been stabbed to death and decapitated. Hundreds of women had been molested by PLO youths who demanded that they stop using cosmetics and dress "suitably". In some cases acid had been thrown at Arab women who failed to comply, grievously injuring them and disfiguring them for life.

In a part of the world where the status of women left much to be desired, Israel had introduced changes. Palestinian women, most of whom came from refugee camps and had previously worked in domestic service where they were misused or exploited, were now working in Israeli factories, which had given

(Mr. Tenne, Israel)

them a new sense of their own worth. Acting within the framework of the existing local law, the Israeli Administration had regulated working hours, assured the right not to be compelled to work night shifts, banned the employment of women in dangerous occupations and increased paid maternity leave from 21 to 45 days. Conditions of employment and social benefits for Palestinian women were now the same as those applying to men. Female school enrolment was quite high by Middle Eastern standards, with a little over 45 per cent of the primary and secondary school students being female.

The draft resolution was biased and its only real purpose was to discredit Israel. What Palestinian women actually needed was not another anti-Israel resolution but an end to the violence which had terrorized their lives and caused so much suffering.

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution III.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, Ecuador, Finland, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Romania, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 42 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

Mr. MARKS (United States of America) said his country deplored all acts of violence from any quarter and had repeatedly called for restraint by all parties. Israel as the occupying Power was obligated to adhere to the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention. The United States had criticized actions that were inconsistent with that Convention, while recognizing Israel's responsibility to maintain law and order in the occupied

(Mr. Marks, United States)

territories. The level of confrontation should be lowered and the problems solved by non-violent means.

The resolution presented a one-sided view of the difficult situation in the occupied territories. Like others before it, it included sweeping condemnations of Israeli policies and practices without regard to the cycle of violence that had taken so many Palestinian and Israeli lives. Such resolutions did not make a practical contribution to resolving the underlying problem but only deepened divisions. Nor would they ensure the legitimate political rights of the Palestinian people or the security of the State of Israel. The gap between Israelis and Palestinians must be closed and there could be no substitute for diplomacy. For that reason his Government had voted against the resolution.

Draft resolution IV

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Second (Social) Committee had adopted resolution IV by a recorded vote of 31 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution IV.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, Ecuador, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Rwanda, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 37 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions.

Mr. MARKS (United States of America) said that no country had worked harder than his to end apartheid and no country was more firmly opposed to a system of government that stood in stark contrast to the principles of the Charter. The United States had also worked steadfastly for the full rights of women and children to lift the burden of apartheid from their lives. His country had been heartened by the considerable progress made by the international community in framing a practical realistic consensus on how a peaceful political evolution could take place in South Africa, and had worked on resolutions that set out those principles.

Thus it was with great regret that the United States had opposed the resolution. It had done so not because its opposition to apartheid had flagged but because the text included several formulations that fell back from the consensus resolution achieved at the last General Assembly, with the result that it failed to acknowledge either the existing consensus or the substantive progress that continued to be made in the dialogue under way in South Africa. The international community should avoid sending conflicting signals, and the resolution risked doing just that, which was at odds with the intention to encourage negotiations in South Africa.

Mr. BURCUOGLI (Turkey) said his country had abstained from voting on the draft resolution because it did not adequately reflect developments now under way in South Africa. Turkey was determined to contribute to efforts by the international community to dismantle the apartheid regime, which went against all human values.

Draft resolutions V to VII

Draft resolutions V to VII were adopted.

Draft resolutions VIII and IX

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolutions VIII and IX, which were contained in document E/1991/87.

Draft resolutions VIII and IX were adopted.

Draft decisions I and II

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decisions I and II, the texts of which were contained in document E/1991/28.

Draft decisions I and II were adopted.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE SECOND DECADE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (E/1991/39)

Mr. QURESHI (Pakistan) and Mrs. ARUNGU-OLENDE (Kenya) said that had they been present for the vote on draft resolution E/1991/L.19 on implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, they would have voted in favour.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

For participants only

E/1991/SR.13
12 July 1991
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

First regular session of 1991

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 13th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 31 May 1991, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. SILOVIC (Yugoslavia)
(Vice-President)

CONTENTS

Elections and nominations (continued)

Human rights questions

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

In the absence of the President, Mr. Silovic (Yugoslavia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

ELECTIONS AND NOMINATIONS (continued)

Commission on Human Settlements (E/1991/L.2)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to return to the question of elections to the Commission on Human Settlements. With regard to the election in respect of the vacancy to be filled by Asian States that had been postponed from previous sessions, for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1994, the Chairman of the Asian Group had informed the Secretariat that the Group had endorsed the candidature of Bangladesh. As Bangladesh was already a member of the Commission and its term would expire on 31 December 1991, he suggested that Bangladesh's election should become effective on 1 January 1992. In the absence of any other candidate, he would take it, if he heard no objection, that the Council wished to elect Bangladesh by acclamation.

It was so decided.

Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes (E/1991/L.7)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to return to the question of elections to the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes. With regard to the election in respect of the vacancy to be filled by Western European and other States for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1992, the Secretariat had been informed that Norway was a candidate for the seat. In the absence of any other candidates, he would take it, if he heard no objection, that the Council wished to elect Norway by acclamation.

It was so decided.

Committee for the United Nations Population Award

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to return to the question of elections to the Committee for the United Nations Population Award. The Group of Latin American and Caribbean States had informed the Secretariat that El Salvador wished to submit its candidature for a term of three years. He would take it, if he heard no objection, that the Council wished to elect El Salvador by acclamation.

It was so decided.

Board of Trustees of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (E/1991/46 and Add.1 and 2)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to proceed to the appointment of members of the Board of Trustees of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women to fill the vacancies that would be created by the expiration of the terms of five members on 30 June 1991. The Board of Trustees consisted of 11 members nominated by States and appointed by the Council with due regard to the principle of equitable geographical distribution and the fact that the Institute and its work were funded by voluntary contributions. Members of the Board served in their individual capacities for a term of three years and were eligible for reappointment for one further term. Information concerning the membership of the Board of Trustees and the curricula vitae of the persons nominated by States were contained in documents E/1991/46 and Add.1 and Add.2. Since the Group of Asian States, the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States and the Group of Western European and other States had each nominated only one candidate, namely Gule Afruz Mahbub (Bangladesh) for the Asian States, D. Gail Saunders (Bahamas) for the Latin American and Caribbean States, and Kristin Tornes (Norway) for the Western European and other States, he suggested that the Council should appoint those three candidates by acclamation and proceed to elect by secret ballot one member from among the nominees from the African States and one member from among the nominees from the Eastern European States, since the number of persons nominated exceeded the number of vacancies to be filled by members from those two Groups.

It was so decided.

Ms. KIMBALL (Secretary of the Council) said that two of the candidatures in document E/1991/46/Add.1, namely those of Hope Cynthia Sadza (Zimbabwe) and Gorana Sipic (Yugoslavia), had been withdrawn.

At the invitation of the President, Mrs. Elo-Kai Ojamaa (United States of America) and Mrs. Maria Draghici-Sutic (Romania) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	53
Number of invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	53
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	53
Required majority:	27
Number of votes obtained:	
Eastern European States	
Renata Siemienska-Zochowska (Poland):	27
Evka Razvigorova (Bulgaria):	25
African States	
Fatima Benslimane (Morocco):	21
Ahlonkoba Aithnard (Togo):	16
Nantenin Camara (Guinea):	8
Esnath J. Kalyati (Malawi):	8
Ihsan Abdalla Algabshawi (Sudan):	0
Marie-Thérèse Kpwoka (Central African Republic):	0
Colette Samoya Kirura (Burundi):	0

The PRESIDENT said that a second ballot would be conducted between Fatima Benslimane (Morocco) and Ahlonkoba Aithnard (Togo) to elect the member from the Group of African States.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	54
Number of invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	54
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	54
Required majority:	28

Number of votes obtained:

Fatima Benslimane (Morocco): 28

Ahlonkoba Aithnard (Togo): 26

Having obtained the required majority, Renata Siemienska-Zochowska (Poland) and Fatima Benslimane (Morocco) were elected members of the Board of Trustees of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women for a three-year term beginning on 1 July 1991.

HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS (E/1991/22, 23 and 86)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take a decision on the 12 draft resolutions and the 35 draft decisions recommended to it for adoption by the Second (Social) Committee. Draft resolutions I to VII were contained in the report of the Commission on Human Rights (E/1991/22, chap. I). The programme budget implications were contained in documents E/1991/22 and Add.1 and E/1991/C.2/L.18. He reminded members of the Council that, in accordance with the decision taken at the opening of the session, any observer delegation wishing to make a statement should do so before the Council had taken action on a proposal and not when members of the Council were speaking in explanation of vote.

Draft resolution I

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Second (Social) Committee had adopted draft resolution I by 33 votes to 17 in a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution I.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, Ecuador, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Rwanda, Somalia, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Austria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 36 votes to 16.

Mr. BURCUOGLU (Turkey), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution as it did not reflect current developments in South Africa. Nevertheless, Turkey would continue to cooperate with the international community with the aim of securing the dismantling of apartheid.

Mrs. LEGWAILA (Botswana) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution I but wished to abstain on paragraph 5 for reasons of which the Council was well aware.

Mr. KOLAREV (Bulgaria) said that, had he been present at the time of the vote, he would have voted in favour of draft resolution I.

Mr. ABOU-HADID (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, if he had been present at the time of the vote, he would have voted in favour of draft resolution I.

Draft resolutions II to VI

Draft resolutions II to VI were adopted.

Draft resolution VII

The PRESIDENT said that the Second (Social) Committee had adopted draft resolution VII by 31 votes to 6, with 17 abstentions, in a recorded vote.

Mrs. THORPE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that her Government recognized the importance of strengthening the independence of the expert members of the Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. Her delegation was not in principle opposed to a secret ballot and accepted that the independent experts should also have the right to vote by secret ballot. Nevertheless, amendment of the rules of procedure by means of such an interpretation would constitute a dangerous precedent which might lead to far-reaching changes in the functioning of the Organization. If the Commission thought that a vote by secret ballot was necessary, the rules of procedure should be amended by means of the machinery established for that purpose. Accordingly, her delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution VII.

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution VII.

In favour: Argentina, Austria, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Romania, Rwanda, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: China, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Syrian Arab Republic, Zambia.

Abstaining: Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Guinea, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Malaysia, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Somalia, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 30 votes to 4, with 20 abstentions.

Draft resolutions VIII to XI

Draft resolutions VIII to XI were adopted.

Draft resolution XII

The PRESIDENT said that a recorded vote on the draft resolution had been requested.

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution XII.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

Draft resolution XII was adopted by 53 votes to none, with one abstention.

Mr. WALDROP (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that the United States was still deeply concerned over the problems that persisted in South Africa and fully supported the need to dismantle apartheid and institute a democratic, non-racial society. However, considerable progress had been made in recent months and it was therefore important for the international community to take into account the current realities when reviewing the situation in South Africa. Such a review should strike a balance between the justifiable criticisms of the serious shortcomings in the country and a recognition of the progress made. Taking that approach, his delegation had felt obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution XII. The draft contained elements that the United States found completely inappropriate. The expression "apartheid regime" in paragraph 3 was not an exact description of the current situation. By way of comparison, the General Assembly, in resolution 45/176, had used the expression "the South African authorities". Furthermore, the wording of paragraph 5 was far too severe. There had been a distinct improvement in the situation of labour unions and their leaders, and the South African Government had not arrested union members or suppressed union activities.

In view of the importance of the issue, his delegation hoped that in the future it could join the other delegations in adopting draft resolutions on the subject without recourse to a vote. It regretted not having been able to study the wording of the draft resolution in informal consultations before it had been issued as an official document of the Second (Social) Committee. It hoped that another time it would be possible to find a better procedure.

Ms. BUSCHMANN (Observer for Luxembourg) said that her delegation would speak in explanation of vote on behalf of the member States of the European Community.

The PRESIDENT said that Luxembourg, as an observer, was not a member of the Council and could therefore not make a statement after the vote.

Mr. GROLIG (Germany) said that the representative of Luxembourg wished to make a statement on behalf of the member States of the European Community, which were members of the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. RAVEN (United Kingdom) said that, according to his interpretation of the rules of procedure, an observer could make a statement on behalf of certain members of the Council, in that instance the six members which were also members of the European Community. The Community's tradition was that the State which was the European Community President should take the floor on behalf of all its member States.

Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that the members of the Council had voted as States and that the six members in question did not represent the entire European Community. She proposed referring the question to the Legal Counsel.

Mr. MOSTURA (France), supporting the United Kingdom and Germany, said that according to rule 72 (3) of the rules of procedure, the only restriction applicable to observers had to do with the right to vote.

Mr. CASAJUANA (Spain) recalled that two years earlier, in an identical situation, his delegation had been authorized to speak at a time when Spain was President of the European Community.

Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Council) said that because of the confusion regarding the question of statements made by observers, the Council had decided at the beginning of the session that observers should make any statements before the Council took action on a proposal.

Mr. LUKABU KHABOUJI N'ZAJI (Zaire) supported the Moroccan delegation and proposed that one of the six members of the European Community that was a member of the Council should speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. MOSTURA (France), supported by Mr. GROLIG (Germany), requested a five-minute suspension to allow the member States of the European Community to consult with each other.

Mr. MFULA (Zambia) said that the Council should apply the decision it had taken at the beginning of the session. He was therefore opposed to suspending the meeting and proposed that one of the member States of the

(Mr. Mfula, Zambia)

European Community that was a member of the Council should take the floor on behalf of all the members of the Community.

The meeting was suspended at 11.30 a.m. and resumed at 11.40 a.m.

Mr. VAN DER HEIJDEN (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the President of the European Community and of the six members of the Economic and Social Council that were members of the Community, said that he regretted that the latter had been responsible for the confusion and the resulting delay. Actually, they had thought that an explanation of vote given by the President of the Community - instead of six separate explanations - would save the Council time.

The member States of the European Community that were members of the Economic and Social Council had voted in favour of draft resolution XII. However, if they had had an opportunity to discuss the wording of the draft with its sponsors, they would not have failed to make the point that the expression "apartheid regime in South Africa" could have been replaced by the expression "South African authorities".

Mr. MFULA (Zambia) said that the situation in which the Council found itself was all the more deplorable in that the rules of procedure were well known and that such a situation should not even have arisen.

The objections to the expression "apartheid regime" raised by certain delegations were based on racist considerations. The expression used correctly described the South African regime.

The PRESIDENT said that he had been able to consult the Legal Counsel and that he had assured him the procedure just followed at the meeting was in accordance with the usual practice of the United Nations and did not run counter to the rules of procedure. He hoped that the discussion on the matter was closed.

He invited the Council to consider draft decisions I to XXXV, recommended for adoption by the Second (Social) Committee. The text of draft decisions I to XXXI was contained in the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its forty-seventh session (E/1991/22 and Add.1). The text of draft decisions XXX to XXXV was contained in the report of the Second (Social) Committee on agenda item 8 (E/1991/86).

Draft decision I

Draft decision I was adopted.

Draft decision II

Draft decision II was adopted.

Mr. WALDROP (United States of America) pointed out that his country had not taken part in the adoption of draft decision II for reasons that were well known to the Council.

Draft decision III

Draft decision III was adopted.

Draft decision IV

Draft decision IV was adopted.

Mr. WALDROP (United States of America) said that his country welcomed the Council's adoption of draft decision IV, which provided for entrusting an independent expert to prepare a detailed study on the question of respect for the right of everyone to own property alone as well as in association with others. The United States had, in fact, been a co-sponsor, with 14 other countries, of Commission on Human Rights resolution 1991/19 dealing with the same subject. It was convinced that such a study would make a notable contribution to the international community's thinking on the issue. But the financial implications indicated in paragraphs 22 to 30 of document E/1991/22/Add.1 seemed to be greater than warranted. It hoped that prudent and effective management by the staff of the Centre for Human Rights would make it possible to reduce the amounts indicated.

Draft decisions V to XI

Draft decisions V to XI were adopted.

Draft decision XII

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Second (Social) Committee had adopted draft decision XII by 52 votes to 1, with 1 abstention, in a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was taken on draft decision XII.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany,

Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Japan.

Draft decision XII was adopted by 52 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Draft decisions XIII to XVIII

Draft decisions XIII to XVIII were adopted.

Draft decision XIX

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Second (Social) Committee had adopted draft decision XIX, in a recorded vote, by 50 votes to none.

A recorded vote was taken on draft decision XIX.

In favour: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Draft decision XIX was adopted by 50 votes to none.

Draft decision XX

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Second (Social) Committee had adopted draft decision XX, in a recorded vote, by 19 votes to 11, with 23 abstentions.

Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Observer for Cuba) said the Cuban delegation had explained to the Second (Social) Committee that draft decision XX was absolutely unfair and there was no reason for it. Cuba had not been censured either by the Commission on Human Rights or by any other organ of the United Nations and no decision had been taken with regard to Cuba on the subject of human rights violations. Furthermore, the draft decision was even in contradiction with the report of the Secretary-General on the question.

It was for that reason, and for many others as well, that the draft decision was a violation of United Nations established procedures and practices with regard to human rights. Furthermore, the text before the Council was in fact that of an oral amendment made by the United States delegation during the voting process in the Commission on Human Rights. The submission of that amendment had led the sponsors of the draft decision to withdraw their sponsorship prior to the vote because the new text totally changed the intent and purpose of the initial draft. The Second (Social) Committee during its session had not taken up the substantive issues of the draft decision on which the Council was to act. In fact, the draft was part of an aggressive policy against Cuba which had been carried out for more than 30 years by the country sponsoring the amendment. That policy, which had nothing to do with human rights, constituted a flagrant violation of the rights of an entire people.

The Cuban delegation had submitted a draft resolution on the negative impact of the United States economic embargo on the full exercise of the human rights of the Cuban people. The text had posed procedural difficulties and his delegation had not insisted that it should be considered immediately. However, once it was resubmitted, those who were prepared to excuse the aggressive policy of the United States against Cuba would then be able to show whether the reasons which had caused them to do so had any connection at all with legitimate concern for human rights.

A recorded vote was taken on draft decision XX.

In favour: Argentina, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Algeria, Burkina Faso, China, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Malaysia, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zambia.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Botswana, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Ecuador, Guinea, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Mexico, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Rwanda, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Draft decision XX was adopted by 19 votes to 11, with 23 abstentions.

Draft decisions XXI to XXIII

Draft decisions XXI to XXIII were adopted.

Draft decision XXIV

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Second (Social) Committee had adopted draft decision XXIV, in a recorded vote, by 43 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on draft decision XXIV.

In favour: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan.

Draft decision XXIV was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Draft decisions XXV to XXXI

Draft decisions XXV to XXXI were adopted.

The PRESIDENT suggested the following draft decision for consideration by the Council:

"The Economic and Social Council takes note of the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its forty-seventh session and of the draft provisional agenda for its forty-eighth session (as contained in Chapter 26, page 310, of the English text of the report of the Commission);"

Mr. TENNE (Observer for Israel) said the Commission on Human Rights had as usual adopted resolutions on so-called human rights violations in various geographic zones, notably Judea, Samaria, the Gaza Strip, the Golan Heights and southern Lebanon. The common denominator of those texts was that they were all part of a relentless campaign to defame Israel, without any regard for factual truth. It would be futile to attempt to refute those accusations, which were without any foundation whatsoever; that had already been done during the debates of the Commission on Human Rights. Those resolutions constituted a transparent attempt to legitimize a political agenda whose only purpose was the demise of Israel under the guise of concern to protect human rights. That most of the sponsors of those resolutions were not exactly champions of human rights in their own countries was hardly surprising. What was surprising, however, was that representatives of genuine democracies should lend themselves to a political exercise of that sort and vote accordingly, to the detriment of the real task of the Commission on Human Rights, namely, to deal with the true violations of human rights perpetrated by some of its members.

Mr. ABOU-HADID (Syrian Arab Republic) was surprised at what had been said by the representative of Israel, who had taken the floor for no reason; he had attacked the Economic and Social Council, accusing it of adopting iniquitous resolutions. He had not even mentioned the historical name of the Palestinian people or those of other Arabs in the occupied territories. The

(Mr. Abou-Hadid, Syrian Arab Republic)

resolutions adopted by the Commission on Human Rights resulted from the very fact of the occupation, which the international community had condemned. It was time for Israel to agree at last to the implementation of United Nations resolutions.

The draft decision was adopted.

Draft decisions XXXII to XXXIV

Draft decisions XXXII to XXXIV were adopted.

Draft decision XXXV

Draft decision XXXV was adopted.

Ms. DINH THI MINH HUYEN (Observer for Viet Nam) welcomed the adoption without a vote of the decision on the situation in Cambodia, but regretted that, although it had been adopted during the Council's consideration of the human rights situation, it did not mention the genocide which had taken place in Cambodia in the recent past nor measures that might prevent the recurrence of such genocide. Furthermore, the decision made no reference to the serious human rights violations to which the Cambodian refugees in the refugee camps were subject. She hoped that the comprehensive settlement of the Cambodian question would be speedily attained: it should be based on respect for the national sovereignty of Cambodia and for the United Nations Charter. The internal affairs of Cambodia depended solely on the Supreme National Council, which represented Cambodia's national sovereignty, and Viet Nam would fully respect the decisions of that body.

Mr. ABOU-HADID (Syrian Arab Republic) asked the President to specify on what procedural basis the observer for Viet Nam had spoken and whether it had been in explanation of vote.

The PRESIDENT said that any delegation wishing to make a statement could do so.

The Council had thus concluded consideration of agenda item 8.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

For participants only

E/1991/SR.14
5 June 1991

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

First regular session of 1991

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 14th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 31 May 1991, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. SILOVIĆ (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters

Consideration of the provisional agenda for the second regular session in 1991

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

91-55778 3693S (E)

/...

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS (E/1991/L.17/Add.1)

Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Council) reminded the Council that if it adopted draft resolution III entitled "Enlargement of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs", elections would be held in the afternoon of Friday, 21 June 1991, to fill the 10 vacancies. He drew attention to an error in the provisional agenda in that the provisional agenda for the second regular session of 1991 was to be considered at the present meeting.

The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to approve the proposed schedule of work contained in document E/1991/L.17/Add.1, as orally revised.

It was so decided.

CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE SECOND REGULAR SESSION OF 1991 (E/1991/L.20)

Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Council) said that in adopting the resolution on emergency assistance to Somalia mentioned in document E/1991/L.21/Rev.1, paragraph 10, the Council had decided to ask the Secretary-General, in view of the urgency of the matter, to report to the Economic and Social Council during its second regular session. The Secretariat had suggested that that report should be considered under item 17, Special economic and humanitarian assistance.

Mr. MAJOOR (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the European Community, recalled that during the informal consultations he had proposed that agenda items 15, 16, 17, 18 and part of 12 should be clustered as part of a broad discussion of issues relevant to emergency relief, refugees, displaced persons and returnees. The rationale for that proposal was that under various agenda items reports were to be considered on the capacity of the United Nations system to deal with disasters and, under agenda item 12, with

(Mr. Majoor, Netherlands)

refugees, displaced persons and returnees. All such issues be should clustered and the Council should at the same time discuss the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, rather than merely transmitting it to the General Assembly without debate, so as to make the discussion as full as possible.

The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council approved the suggestion of the Netherlands representative, that the report of the High Commissioner for Refugees should be discussed.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve the draft provisional agenda for the second regular session of the Council (E/1991/L.20, sect. I), as revised.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT drew attention to section II of document E/1991/L.20, dealing with the organization of work for the second regular session of 1991.

Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that a separate provisional agenda and organization of work would be issued for the Special High-level Meeting at ministerial level to be held on 4 and 5 July, which therefore was not mentioned in the agenda just adopted. Given that the agency heads would participate in that meeting, and since the July agenda was very full, it was thought that the Council might wish to dispense with the one-day informal exchange of views normally scheduled to follow the general debate.

Statements by the Executive Secretaries of the regional commissions, originally scheduled for the morning of Thursday, 11 July, were to be heard instead on Tuesday, 9 July.

It was suggested that, for convenience, item 6, International cooperation to study, mitigate and minimize the consequences of the disaster at Chernobyl, originally scheduled to be discussed at 3 p.m. on Tuesday, 16 July, be considered instead on Monday, 22 July.

Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia) suggested that, as the Special High-level Meetings were an integral part of the Economic and Social Council, they should be listed for 4 and 5 July instead of the "No meeting" entries.

Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Council) said that the Council had decided that the special meeting should be separate from the regular meetings of the Council. Accordingly, the Secretariat had thought it inappropriate to include it in the programme of work now under discussion.

Mr. MAJOOR (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the European Community, said that the Tunisian suggestion was acceptable. Moreover, the general debate might take less time than the alloted four days; two and a half days might be sufficient, if the speakers' list was initially opened for that period, and only extended once all available meeting time had been filled.

All of the reports of the Committee on Development Planning were to be considered during the general debate, but that Committee had been studying developments in eastern Europe and their effects on the world economy and especially that of the developing countries, discussion of which might more appropriately take place during the High-level Meeting. Moreover, the Committee had been studying criteria for identifying the least developed countries, and it might be better to consider that issue under a specific agenda item, such as item 8.

He reiterated his proposal that questions relating to humanitarian assistance should be clustered for consideration. Specifically, two reports to be reviewed under agenda item 12, namely a report on refugees, displaced persons and returnees, and the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the same question, could usefully be combined with agenda items 15, 16, 17 and 18, so that the whole issue could be more thoroughly considered.

It would be useful to have some information on the organization of the High-level Meeting, so that representatives' capitals could be apprised of the proposed arrangements.

Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Council) said that with respect to the length of the general discussion on international economic and social policy, paragraph 8 of document E/1991/L.20 stipulated that the discussion should not exceed four days. In addition, he noted that the pertinent chapters of the report of the Committee for Development Planning would be made available for the discussion on East-West relations.

(Mr. Stoby)

For the Special High-level Meeting, whose provisional agenda and organization of work would be issued the following week, four documents would be available: (1) the report of the Secretary-General on the impact of the recent evolution of East-West relations on the growth of the world economy, in particular on the economic growth and development of the developing countries, as well as on international economic cooperation (E/1991/82); (2) chapter 6 of the World Economic Survey, 1991 (E/1991/75); (3) pertinent sections of the report of the Committee for Development Planning on its twenty-seventh session (E/1991/32, Supp. No. 11); and (4) a summary of the economic survey of Europe, 1990-1991 (E/1991/64). Also available would be the note verbale of 13 May 1991 from the representative of Algeria transmitting the Declaration of the Algiers Colloquium (E/1991/78). The Bureau of the Council had decided that the Special High-level Meeting would have a separate Bureau, consisting of representatives of the same States that composed the Bureau of the Council, but at the ministerial level. Two formal sessions of the Meeting would be held on 4 and 5 July, and a closed meeting for the heads of delegations and representatives of specialized agencies would be held on the afternoon of 5 July.

Mr. TSUI (Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Cooperation) said that with respect to the question on the report of the Committee for Development Planning, and specifically on the review of criteria for identifying the least developed countries, the Council's traditional practice had been to address that issue under agenda item 2 (general discussion). It could also be addressed under agenda item 8 (a) in the context of the Council's consideration of the report of the Trade and Development Board. That was for the Council to decide.

With respect to the proposal of the representative of the Netherlands to cluster the items on United Nations capacity for humanitarian response, he noted that since sub-items (a) and (b) of item 16 were very specific, it might be desirable to hold a separate discussion on those two sub-items.

Mr. MACEDO (Mexico) asked whether, if the date of the discussion on item 6 was changed as proposed, the date for the closure of the list of

(Mr. Macedo, Mexico)

speakers for that item would also be changed. In addition, he wished to know how the change would affect the rest of the schedule of meetings.

Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Council) said that if the proposal to hold the discussion on item 6 on the morning of 22 July was accepted, the deadlines for inscription on the list of speakers and for the submission of draft proposals would be adjusted accordingly. The change would not affect the rest of the schedule of meetings.

Mr. AL-FAIHANI (Bahrain) asked for clarification of the reference in paragraph 10 of document E/1991/L.20 to dispensing with the one-day informal exchange of views.

Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Council) said that the Council was required, under its resolution 1989/114, to hold an informal exchange of views with the heads of specialized agencies on the issues raised in the general discussion. However, since two additional occasions for an exchange of views (on the report of the South Commission and on the economic, social and environmental consequences of the situation between Iraq and Kuwait) had been scheduled for the second regular session of 1991, an exchange of views on the general discussion might not be necessary.

Mr. ABOU-HADID (Syrian Arab Republic), supported by Mrs. HASSAN (Observer for Egypt), noted that only one meeting had been scheduled, on the morning of 16 July, on agenda item 5 regarding permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories. Since the meeting originally scheduled for the afternoon of that day was to be held on 22 July, he proposed that the afternoon of 16 July should be devoted to continued consideration of item 5, given the vital importance of the issue.

Ms. HJELT af TROLLE (Sweden) said she supported the proposal of the representative of the Netherlands concerning the clustering of the items on the capacity of the United Nations to respond to emergency situations. Since existing documents on emergency-related issues would be relevant to the discussion, she wondered whether the Secretariat could reissue those documents.

Mr. BRITO CRUZ (Brazil), supported by Mr. NIETO (Argentina), said that he disagreed with the suggestion that the Council should dispense with the informal exchange of views on the general discussion because the main focus of the general discussion would be on multilateral cooperation in international economic affairs, which was directly linked to the work of many United Nations bodies; an exchange of views with the executive heads of those bodies would therefore be of particular importance. Since the draft programme of work made no provision for the traditional one-day informal exchange of views following the general discussion, it would have to be revised if the other Council members agreed that such an exchange of views should not be omitted. The Council could leave the question open for the moment and return to it at its resumed session in June.

Mr. MACEDO (Mexico) said that the exchange of views should be returned for the time being, on the understanding that the proposed change would be introduced in 1992.

Mr. MAQUIEIRA (Chile) said he would favour a flexible approach to the issue of dispensing with the informal exchange of views; the decision could be taken in the light of the time to be spent on the general debate.

Mr. MAJOOR (Netherlands), responding to the comment by the representative of the Office of the Director-General, said he recognized that items 16 (a) and (b) were indeed very specific; however, he was not convinced that they therefore needed to be debated separately.

He would also welcome more information on the informal session of the High-level Meeting. Would specific subjects be dealt with, and was it to be a negotiating session? He also asked what the proposed outcome of the meeting was and whether a presidential summation was aimed for.

The PRESIDENT said that the informal session of the High-level Meeting was not a negotiating meeting, and no documentation would result. The President of the High-level Meeting would make his own resume of the discussion, but participants in the informal meeting would discuss what they saw fit.

Mr. AL-FAIHANI (Bahrain), referring to agenda item 5, said he did not understand why the meetings had been reduced to a single meeting. He also did not understand why documents were being distributed so late.

Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Council) said there were not usually several meetings on the Palestinian issue. However, the Council was free to decide that two or more meetings should be held, if it so wished.

The PRESIDENT said he took it that there was agreement in the Council to reduce the general debate to two and half days, if possible, using part of the time thus saved for an informal exchange of views with the heads of agencies, and to cluster the discussion of items 15, 16, 17, 18 and part of 12. Moreover, if item 6 (Chernobyl) were moved to 22 July, there would be enough time to discuss item 5 (Palestine) on 16 July.

Mr. KHALIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said it would be difficult on such short notice for his country to agree to shifting the discussion of the Chernobyl issue to another time-slot, as it intended to send high-level special representatives to participate. He asked the Council to consider keeping the programme of work as it presently was.

Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Council) said the Chernobyl agenda item could be moved to the afternoon of 15 July, the item on revitalization of economic growth and development of the developing countries could be moved to the morning of 16 July, and discussion of the Palestinian item could begin on the afternoon of 16 July, with a second meeting allocated for the morning of 17 July.

Mr. BRITO CRUZ (Brazil) said that it was important to have an informal exchange of views with the executive heads; however, the Council need not take a decision immediately. A flexible approach should be taken, so that a way could be found to schedule the informal exchange of views without shortening the general discussion.

Mr. MAJOOR (Netherlands) said that the Secretariat should be allowed some flexibility in scheduling the informal exchange of views with the executive heads; however, the exchange of views should take place during the time allotted for the general discussion.

Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia) said that he fully agreed with the representative of Brazil on the need for flexibility. In any event, paragraph 10 of document E/1991/L.20 would have to be revised to reflect the change in the draft programme of work.

Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Council) said that it would be possible to schedule an extended afternoon meeting on 10 July in order to hold the informal exchange of views with the executive heads.

The PRESIDENT said that the suggestion by the Secretary was helpful because it would enable the Council to hold the informal exchange of views with the executive heads without shortening the general discussion. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to approve the draft programme of work of the second regular session of 1991 (E/1991/L.20, sect. II), as orally revised.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to section III of document E/1991/L.20, on the status of documentation for the second regular session as at 22 May 1991.

Mr. Al-FAIHANI (Bahrain) inquired when the report of the Secretary-General on Israeli land and water policies and practices in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories under provisional agenda item 5 would be submitted. In that connection, he stressed the need to give delegations ample time to consider the relevant documentation.

Ms. HJELT af TROLLE (Sweden) recalled that she had asked whether earlier documents on emergency-related items could be reissued.

Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Council) said that the report of the Secretary-General on Israeli land and water policies and practices in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories would be issued in three weeks under the symbol E/1991/88. He would be happy to consult with the representative of Sweden and have relevant documents made available as background or reference documents.

Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia), referring to the documentation for item 18 of the provisional agenda, said that the note verbale from the Permanent Mission of Algeria containing the Declaration of the Algiers Colloquium and other relevant United Nations documents should be made available for consideration by the Special High-level Meeting.

Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Council) said that that would be done.

The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council took note of the status of documentation as at 22 May 1991, as contained in section III of document E/1991/L.20.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

For participants only

E/1991/SR.15
26 June 1991

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Resumed first regular session of 1991

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 15th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 21 June 1991, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. ELIASSON (Sweden)
(Vice-President)

CONTENTS

Narcotic drugs (continued)

Elections (continued)

Closure of the session

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

91-55897 3758S (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

NARCOTIC DRUGS (continued) (E/1991/11, E/1991/24 and E/1991/103)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the 11 draft resolutions and one draft decision which the Second (Social) Committee recommended for adoption in paragraphs 23 and 24 of its report (E/1991/103).

Draft resolutions I, II and IV to X

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolutions I, II and IV to X, the text of which appeared in chapter I of document E/1991/24.

Draft resolutions I, II and IV to X were adopted.

Draft resolutions XI and XII

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolutions XI and XII, the texts of which appeared in paragraph 23 of document E/1991/103.

Ms. TERANISHI (Japan) said that her delegation would have liked to have been a sponsor of draft resolutions XI and XII, but had been unable to do so for lack of time. In that connection, she stressed the need to abide by rule 54 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council. Delegations should be given sufficient time to receive instructions from their Governments on questions under consideration.

Draft resolutions XI and XII were adopted.

Draft decision I

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision I, the text of which appeared in paragraph 24 of document E/1991/103.

Draft decision I was adopted.

The meeting was suspended at 3.50 p.m. and resumed at 5.10 p.m.

The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to document E/1991/103/Add.1, containing Part II of the report of the Second (Social) Committee, and invited the Council to consider draft resolution III entitled

(The President)

"Enlargement of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs", which was contained in paragraph 8 of that document, while its programme budget implications were indicated in paragraph 4 of the document.

Mr. FEYDER (Observer for Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the Twelve States members of the European Community, noted that a draft resolution on the enlargement of the Commission had been adopted by consensus in Vienna, where it had been sponsored by 59 States, representing all geographical groups of the United Nations. The result of intense negotiations, the draft resolution adopted in Vienna had reflected general agreement on how the Commission on Narcotic Drugs should be enlarged. As the Commission played a very vital role at the international level, qualitative criteria must also be considered in the enlargement process.

The Twelve deeply regretted that many of the draft resolution's sponsors in Vienna no longer felt able to support it. The amendment that had been submitted to draft resolution III had many positive aspects, and in a spirit of compromise, the Twelve had not opposed it. The Twelve believed that it would be extremely dangerous to politicize the work of the Commission. They wished to emphasize that any enlargement of the Commission must be supported by the largest possible majority of Member States and take into account the interests of all regional groups of the United Nations, including those of the major donor countries.

Mr. KOTEY (Observer for Ghana), speaking on behalf of the States members of the Group of 77, expressed appreciation to all regional groups for participating in the extensive informal consultations which had resulted in the draft resolution now before the Council. The Group of 77 wished to clarify that it had introduced amendments to the draft resolution in the conviction that enlargement of the Commission should redress current imbalances in geographical representation. In no way were those amendments intended to politicize the issue of enlargement, which the Group of 77 supported. Rather, they were aimed at improving the participation of underrepresented groups in the Commission. Equitable geographical representation was a principle recognized in the Charter of the United Nations and other international organizations. Accordingly, the Group of 77 had

(Mr. Kotey, Observer, Ghana)

proposed that the additional seats gained from enlargement of the Commission should be allocated to underrepresented regional groups, namely, the Asian, Latin American and Caribbean and African States.

The Commission had been enlarged four times since its establishment. The most recent enlargement, by 40 seats, which had taken place in 1983, had not taken into account the interests of those regions which had joined the Commission after its establishment. As a result, the Group of Western European and other States, whose 24 Member States represented 15.3 per cent of the membership of the United Nations, held 13, or 32.5 per cent, of the seats on the Commission. The Eastern European Group, whose 10 Member States represented 6.4 per cent of the membership of the United Nations, held five, or 12.5 per cent of the seats. By contrast, the African Group, whose 51 Member States represented 32.5 per cent of the membership of the United Nations, held only 7, or 17.5 per cent of the seats on the Commission. The pattern was repeated in the case of the Asian and Latin American and Caribbean Groups. The Group of 77 had remained flexible throughout the consultations on the enlargement of the Commission. It had done so in the belief that such an important resolution must enjoy unanimous support and out of a desire to show its willingness to cooperate with other regional groups in the Council. The Group of 77 hoped that the spirit of conciliation and understanding it had shown would be reciprocated in the future.

Draft resolution III on the enlargement of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs was adopted.

Ms. COOMBS (New Zealand), speaking on behalf of Canada, Australia and New Zealand, said that they had supported the enlargement of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs in recognition of the need for greater international cooperation in the fight against drug abuse, and of the fact that the international drug situation and the membership of the United Nations had changed significantly since the Commission's establishment. The three countries had been sponsors of the Vienna resolution. They had worked hard to achieve consensus on the enlargement of the Commission both in Vienna and at the current session. They could have supported many of the proposals put forward in the past few days, and were pleased that one had finally proved agreeable to all members of the Council.

Ms. OJAMAA (United States of America) said that, in the interest of furthering the work of the Council and international cooperation in combating the scourge of drugs, her delegation had not objected to adoption of the resolution without a vote. It was none the less very disappointing and puzzling that the Council could not adopt the proposal recommended by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. As it had stated in the general debate on agenda item 10, her delegation believed that the Council should have affirmed its confidence in a proposal which had been sponsored by 59 Member States and observers at the Commission's thirty-fourth session and adopted without a vote. That proposal had been negotiated fully, taking into account the interests and concerns of all regions and the specific mandate of the Commission.

Mr. DUHS (Sweden), speaking on behalf of Finland and Sweden, the Nordic members of the Council, noted that at recent sessions the Council had decided to enlarge various subsidiary bodies. In 1990, it had decided on the enlargement of the Commission on Human Rights by 10 members; at the current session, it had decided on the enlargement of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. The Finnish and Swedish delegations were pleased to note that, despite certain difficulties, the resolution on that enlargement had been adopted without a vote. Consensus within the Council on the size and composition of subsidiary bodies was vital to the proper functioning of those bodies.

The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to paragraph 9 of document E/1991/103/Add.1, in which the Second (Social) Committee had recommended adoption of draft decision II. In that draft decision, the Council was invited to take note of the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on its thirty-fourth session (E/1991/24).

Draft decision II was adopted.

The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 10.

ELECTIONS (continued)

Commission on Human Settlements

The PRESIDENT announced that the Chairman of the Group of Eastern European States had informed the Secretariat that it supported the candidacy

(The President)

of Bulgaria for the vacancy which had occurred, for a four-year term, beginning on 1 January 1992.

There being no other candidates, Bulgaria was elected by acclamation.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

The President declared closed the first regular session of 1991 of the Economic and Social Council.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.